capacities of the DOE Defendants when such identities become known.

4. At all relevant times, each and every Defendant was acting as an agent and/or employee of each of the other Defendants and was acting within the course and/or scope of said agency and/or employment with the full knowledge and consent of each of the Defendants. Each of the acts and/or omissions complained of herein were alleged and made known to, and ratified by, each of the other Defendants (Lincoln National Corporation d/b/a Lincoln Financial Group and DOE Defendants will hereafter collectively be referred to as "Defendant").

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 5. A Court has diversity jurisdiction over this class action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332 as amended by the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 because the amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is a class action in which some members of the class are citizens of different states than the Defendant. *See* 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2)(A).
- 6. This Court also has personal jurisdiction over Defendant because Defendant currently does business in this state.
- 7. Venue is proper in this jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Defendant is subject to personal jurisdiction in this District and a substantial portion of the conduct complained of herein occurred in this District.

III. FACTS

- 8. In the summer of 2012, Plaintiff called Defendant's customer service telephone number (1-800-454-6265) to inquire about Defendant's life insurance eligibility requirements. Plaintiff was connected to a customer service representative and they proceeded to have a sensitive, private and confidential discussion wherein Plaintiff first provided his name and social security number and then proceeded to discuss his serious concerns about his ongoing health problems and his eligibility for life insurance.
- 9. Plaintiff was not aware that the call was being recorded. Defendant did not, at any point during the telephone conversation with Defendant's customer service representative, advise Plaintiff that the call was being recorded. Plaintiff did not give either express or implied consent to the recording.

- 10. After completing his call, Plaintiff learned that Defendant records *all* incoming telephone calls but does not disclose this to callers unless specifically asked. During the course of investigating this matter, but prior to filing this Complaint, an investigator engaged by counsel for Plaintiff contacted Defendant and spoke to a representative names "Sam" and asked (1) whether Defendant records or monitors incoming telephone calls, and (2) whether Defendant discloses such recording or monitoring to callers. Defendant's customer service representative stated unequivocally, that "all calls are recorded."
- 11. Plaintiff expected that his telephone call would be private (i.e., neither recorded nor monitored) due to: (1) the sensitive and confidential nature of the conversation; and (2) Defendant's assurances that it respects the privacy of its customers. Indeed, Defendant's website assures present and future customers that "Lincoln Financial Group is committed to keeping the personal information collected about our potential, current and former customers confidential and secure in compliance with state and federal laws."
- Plaintiff's subjective expectation of privacy was objectively reasonable based upon prevailing societal norms. Indeed, one recent poll showed that 73% of Americans believe that it is "extremely important" that conversations never be recorded or monitored without the consent of all parties. *See* Harris Poll #17, March 19, 2003; *see also* Katz, <u>Privacy and Information Technology</u>, Public Opinion Quarterly 54, no. 1 (1990), at 125-143 (concluding that privacy of telephone calls is very important to most Americans and that the idea of secretly recording or monitoring of telephone calls is upsetting to a majority of people).
- 13. Accordingly, Plaintiff brings this lawsuit to enjoin the ongoing violations of privacy of hundreds of thousands of people and to recover damages because of this unlawful practice.

IV. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

14. Plaintiff brings this class action for damages and other monetary relief on behalf of the following class:

"All persons located in California whose telephone conversations with

See https://www.lfg.com/LincolnPageServer?LFGPage=/lfg/lfgclient/ftr/privacy/index.html (last visited September 25, 2012).

Defendant were intentionally recorded or monitored by Defendant without disclosure by Defendant at any time during the four years preceding the filing of this Complaint." (the "Class").

- 15. Excluded from the Class are governmental entities, Defendant, any entity in which Defendant has a controlling interest, and Defendant's officers, directors, affiliates, legal representatives, employees, co-conspirators, successors, subsidiaries, and assigns, and individuals bound by any prior settlement. Also excluded from the Class is any judge, justice, or judicial officer presiding over this matter and the members of their immediate families and judicial staff.
- 16. This action is brought and may be properly maintained as a class action pursuant to the provisions of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(1)-(4) and 23(b)(1)-(3). This action satisfies the numerosity, typicality, adequacy, predominance and superiority requirements of those provisions.
- 17. [Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(1)]: The Class is so numerous that the individual joinder of all of its members is impractical. While the exact number and identities of Class members are unknown to Plaintiff at this time and can only be ascertained through appropriate discovery of defendant's books and records, Plaintiff is informed and believes the Class includes hundreds of thousands of members.
- 18. [Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(2)]: Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of the Class which predominate over any questions affecting only individual members of the Class. These common legal and factual questions, which do not vary from class member to class member, and which may be determined without reference to the individual circumstances of any class member, include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - (a) Whether Defendant intentionally records or monitors confidential telephone communications;
 - (b) Whether Defendant obtains consent before intentionally recording or monitoring confidential telephone communications;
 - (c) Whether Defendant's conduct constitutes a violation of California Penal Code sections 631(a), 632(a), 632.7 and/ or 637;
 - (d) Whether Defendant's conduct is "unfair" under Bus. & Prof. Code Section 17200;

- 5
- 8
- 10
- 12 13
- 14
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 23
- 26
- 27
- 28

- Whether, as a result of Defendant's misconduct, Plaintiff and the Class are (e) entitled to damages, restitution, equitable relief and other relief, and the amount and nature of such relief.
- 19. [Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3)]: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the members of the Class. Plaintiff and all members of the Class have been subjected to Defendant's common course of unlawful conduct as complained of herein and are entitled to the same statutory damages based on Defendant's wrongful conduct as alleged herein.
- 20. [Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4)]: Plaintiff will fairly and adequately protect the interests of the members of the Class. Plaintiff has retained attorneys experienced in the prosecution of class actions who have previously been certified as class counsel in a variety of class action lawsuits in both state and federal court.
- 21. [Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3)]: A class action is superior to other available methods of fair and efficient adjudication of this controversy, since individual litigation of the claims of all Class members is impracticable. Even if every Class member could afford individual litigation, the court system could not. It would be unduly burdensome to the courts in which individual litigation of numerous issues would proceed. Individualized litigation would also present the potential for varying, inconsistent, or contradictory judgments and would magnify the delay and expense to all parties and to the court system resulting from multiple trials of the same complex factual issues. By contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action, with respect to some or all of the issues presented herein, presents fewer management difficulties, conserves the resources of the parties and of the court system, and protects the rights of each Class member.
- 22. [Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(1)(A)]: The prosecution of separate actions by hundreds of thousands of individual Class members would create the risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to, among other things, the need for and the nature of proper notice, which Defendant must provide to all Class members.
- 23. [Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(1)(B)]: The prosecution of separate actions by individual class members would create a risk of adjudications with respect to them that would, as a practical matter, be dispositive of the interests of the other Class members not parties to such adjudications or that would

substantially impair or impede the ability of such non-party Class members to protect their interests.

24. [Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2)]: Defendant has acted or refused to act in respects generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive relief with regard to the members of the Class as a whole.

V. <u>CAUSES OF ACTION</u>

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

Penal Code § 630, et seq.

(By Class Against All Defendants)

- 25. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.
- 26. As part of the California Invasion of Privacy Act, the Legislature enacted section 632 of the California Penal Code in 1967 to address the growing concern that "advances in science and technology have led to the development of new devices and techniques for the purpose of eavesdropping upon private communications and that the invasion of privacy resulting from the continual and increasing use of such devices and techniques has created a serious threat to the free exercise of personal liberties and cannot be tolerated in a free and civilized society." Cal. Penal Code § 630.
- 27. Section 632 prohibits the non-consensual recording, monitoring, and/or eavesdropping upon confidential telephone communications by means of any electronic amplifying or recording device, including a wiretap. "Intentional" within the context of section 632 merely requires that a defendant intend that the confidential communication be recorded, monitored, and/or eavesdropped upon. See People v. Superior Court of Los Angeles County, 70 Cal. 2d 123, 133 (1969). No other wrongful or surreptitious intent is required, only that the defendant intended to record the confidential communication is necessary.
- 28. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendant knowingly violated Cal. Pen Code § 632 by habitually, and making a practice of, routinely recording, monitoring, and/or eavesdropping upon confidential communications of its customers and potential customers. Such communications are considered to be confidential to those customers and potential customers

who call Defendant because such communications are carried on under circumstances that reasonably indicate that the customer-party to the communication desires it to be confined to them and Defendant.

- 29. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that all of Defendant's employees are trained and/or directed to routinely record or monitor confidential communications with customers and potential customers by means of recording device and/or wiretap. Such employees are agents of Defendant and were acting within the course and scope of employment of Defendant when such confidential communications were recorded, monitored, and/or eavesdropped upon without Plaintiff's or the Class's knowledge.
- 30. Plaintiff is informed an believes, and thereon alleges that the foregoing recording, monitoring, and/or eavesdropping on said confidential communications without consent via recording device, including but not limited to wiretapping, constitutes a violation of California Penal Code sections 631(a) and 632.6(a).
- 31. Based on the foregoing violations, Plaintiff and members of the Class are entitled to and seek the statutory remedies provided in section 637.2 of the California Penal Code, i.e. \$5,000 per statutory violation or three times the amount of actual damages, whichever is higher.
- 32. Plaintiff and the Class further seek attorneys' fees pursuant to section 1021.5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, or any other applicable statute, as this action enforces an important right affecting the public's interest.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

Penal Code § 632.7

(By Plaintiff Against All Defendants)

- 33. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.
- 34. Section 632.7 prohibits the intentional, non-consensual recording of a telephone communication without the consent of all parties where at least one party to the conversation is either using a cordless or cellular telephone. No other wrongful or surreptitious intent is required, only that the defendant intended to record the communication.
 - 35. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that Defendant knowingly

violated Cal. Pen Code § 632.7 by habitually, and making a practice of, routinely and intentionally recording the cordless and cellular telephone conversations of its customers and potential customers without their consent.

- 36. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that all of Defendant's employees are trained and/or directed to routinely record the cordless and cellular telephone communications with customers and potential customers by means of recording device. Such employees are agents of Defendant and were acting within the course and scope of employment of Defendant when such communications were intentionally recorded without Plaintiff's or the Class's consent.
- 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges that the foregoing intentional recording of his and the Class's cellular and cordless telephone conversations without their consent constitutes a violation of California Penal Code sections 632.7.
- 38. Based on the foregoing violations, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to and seek the statutory remedies provided in section 637.2 of the California Penal Code, i.e. \$5,000 per statutory violation or three times the amount of actual damages, whichever is higher.
- 39. Plaintiff and the Class further seeks attorneys' fees pursuant to section 1021.5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure, or any other applicable statute, as this action enforces an important right affecting the public's interest.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION

Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

(By Class Against All Defendants)

- 40. Plaintiff incorporates by this reference the allegations contained in the preceding paragraphs above as if fully set forth herein.
- 41. California Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq., (the "Unfair Competition Law" or "UCL") authorizes private lawsuits to enjoin acts of "unfair competition" which includes any unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business practice.
- 42. The UCL imposes strict liability. Plaintiff need not prove that Defendant intentionally or negligently engaged in unlawful, unfair or fraudulent business practices—but only that such

- 43. The intentional, routine, and unlawful recording, monitoring, and/or eavesdropping upon Plaintiff and the Class's confidential communications with Defendant via recording device without consent is an unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practice as it violates section 630 et seq. of the Penal Code. These unlawful practices are thus prohibited by the UCL.
- 44. In carrying out such unlawful business practices, Defendant has violated sections 631(a) and 632.6(a) of the California Penal Code, and various other laws, regulations, statutes, and/or common law duties. Defendant's business practices alleged herein, therefore, are unlawful within the meaning of the UCL.
- 45. The harm to Plaintiff and members of the public outweighs the utility of Defendant's practices and, consequently, Defendant's practices, as set forth fully above, constitute an unfair business act or practice within the meaning of the UCL.
- 46. Defendant's practices are additionally unfair because they have caused Plaintiff and the Class substantial injury, which is not outweighed by any countervailing benefits to consumers, Defendant's business, or to competition, and is not an injury the consumers themselves could have reasonably avoided.
- 47. Defendant's practices, as set forth above, are unlawful business practices because they violate section 630 et seq. of the Penal Code and constitute unscrupulous, unethical, and substantially injurious conduct to consumers. Consequently, Defendant's practices constitute an unlawful and unfair business practice within the meaning of the UCL.
- 48. Pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 17204, an action for unfair competition may be brought by any "person . . . who has suffered injury in fact and has lost money or property as a result of such unfair competition." Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to statutory damages or three times the amount of actual damages, whichever is higher, pursuant to section 637.2(a) and as such have suffered harm within the meaning of section 630 et seq. of the Penal Code.
- 49. The unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices of Defendant are ongoing and present a continuing threat to members of the public.
 - 50. Pursuant to the UCL, Plaintiff and the Class are entitled to and seek preliminary and

permanent injunctive relief ordering Defendant to cease these unlawful business practices. 1 2 3 PRAYER FOR RELIEF WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, individually and on behalf of the Class, prays for relief and judgment 4 5 as follows: 1. For preliminary and permanent injunctive relief enjoining Defendant, its agents, 6 7 servants and employees, and all persons acting in concert with them, from engaging in, and continuing to engage in, the unfair, unlawful and/or fraudulent business practices alleged above and that may yet 8 be discovered in the prosecution of this action; 9 2. 10 For certification of the putative class: 3. 11 For restitution and disgorgement of all money or property wrongfully obtained by Defendant by means of its herein-alleged unlawful, unfair, and fraudulent business practices; 12 13 4. For an accounting by Defendant for any and all profits derived by Defendant from its 14 herein-alleged unlawful, unfair, and/or fraudulent conduct and/or business practices; 15 5. An award of statutory damages of \$5,000 per violation pursuant to section 637.2(a) of the Penal Code: 16 6. An award of general damages according to proof; 17 7. An award of special damages according to proof: 18 8. An award of exemplary damages; 19 9. 20 For attorneys' fees and expenses pursuant to all applicable laws including, without limitation, Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5 and the common law private attorney general doctrine; 21 10. For costs of suit; and 22 23 11. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper. 24 /// 25 111 26 /// 27 /// 28 ///

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury of all claims and causes of action so triable in this lawsuit. Dated: October 16, 2012 NEWPORT TRIAL GROUP A Professional Corporation Scott J. Ferrell Attorney for Plaintiff and the Class

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Dean D. Pregerson and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Sheri Pym.

The case number on all-documents-filed-with the Court should read as follows:

EDCV12- 1776 DDP (SPx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

Western Division
312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Southern Division
411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053
Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

| Case 5:12-cv-01776-DDP-SP Document 1 | Filed 10/16/12 Page 13 of 15 Page ID #:15 |
|---|--|
| Name & Address: NEWPORT TRIAL GROUP Scott J. Ferrell, Bar No. 202091 James B. Hardin, Bar No. 205071 Victoria C. Knowles, Bar No. 277231 895 Dove Street, Suite 425 Newport Beach, Ca 92660 | |
| | ES DISTRICT COURT RICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| DAVID VAMVAKIAS, individually, and on behalf all others similarly situated, | A 1778 DDP |
| LINCOLN NATIONAL CORPORATION d/b/a LINCOLN FINANCIAL GROUP, an INDIANA corporation; and DOES 1-10, Inclusive, DEFENDANT(S | SUMMONS |
| TO: DEFENDANT(S): | |
| must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached of counterclaim cross-claim or a motion under Rul or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, 895 Dove Street, Suite 425, Newport Beach, CA 926 | e 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer Newport Trial Group, whose address is |
| | TERRY NAFISI Clerk, U.S. District Court |
| Dated:OCT_116 2012 | By: Deputy Clerk (Seal of the Court) |
| [Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United St 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)]. | ates agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed |
| | |
| CV-01A (10/11 St | UMMONS |

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

| I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □) DAVID VAMVAKIAS, individually, and on behalf of all others similarly situated, | | | | DEFENDANTS LINCOLN NATIONAL CORPORATION d/b/a LINCOLN FINANCIAL GROUP, an INDIANA corporation; and DOES 1-10, Inclusive | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-------------|--|---|--------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|------------|--|
| yourself, provide same.) | ddress and Telephone Number. If | | | attomeys (If Known) | | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| | ON (Place an X in one box only.) | | III. CITIZENSI | HP OF PRINCIPAL | PART | TES - | For Diversity Case | es Only | | · | |
| | | | (Place an X | in one box for plaintif | f and or | ne for d | lefendant.) | o Only | | | |
| □ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff | ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Part | y) | Citizen of This St | ate | PTF V1 | DEF I | Incorporated or of Business in the | | PTF □4 | DEF □4 | |
| ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendar | of Parties in Item III) | zenship | Citizen of Anothe | r State | □2 | □2 | Incorporated and of Business in A | d Principal Place | □5 | d 5 | |
| | *************************************** | | Citizen or Subject | of a Foreign Country | □3 | □3 | Foreign Nation | | □6 | □6 | |
| IV. ORIGIN (Place an X in or | | | | | | - | | | | | |
| Proceeding State C | *** | □4 Re Re | instated or D 5 'copened | Transferred from anot | her dist | trict (sp | Dist | rict Judg | eal to I ge from gistrate | 1 | |
| V. REQUESTED IN COMPI | | Yes 🛚 | No (Check 'Yes' o | only if demanded in co | mplain | it.) | | | | | |
| CLASS ACTION under F.R.(| C.P. 23: 2 Yes No | | ММ | ONEY DEMANDED | IN CO |)MPL/ | AINT: S TBD | | | | |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTION (Cit 28USC §§1332 and 1391, | te the U.S. Civil Statute under whi | ich you a | re filing and write | a brief statement of ca | use. D | o not c | ite jurisdictional st | atutes unless div | ersity.) | | |
| VII. NATURE OF SUIT (Place | ce an X in one box only.) | | | | | | | | | | |
| OTHER STATUTES | CONTRACT | | TORTS SONAL INJURY | TORTS PERSONAL | 0145 WAR 2005 W | 78 TO S. O. A.A. | PRISONER PETITIONS | LAB □710 Fair Lal | 20 CARO (\$750) | ndards | |
| ☐ 410 Antitrust ☐ 430 Banks and Banking | ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act | | Airplane Airplane Product | PROPERTY ☐ 370 Other Fraud | | | Motions to Vacate Sentence | Act | | | |
| ☐ 450 Commerce/ICC | ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument | 1 | Liability | □ 371 Truth in Ler | | | Habeas Corpus | ☐ 720 Labor/N Relation | | | |
| Rates/etc. | ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & | LI 320 | Assault, Libel & Slander | 380 Other Perso | | | General | □ 730 Labor/N | | | |
| ☐ 470 Racketeer Influenced | Enforcement of | □ 330 | Fed. Employers' | □ 385 Property Da | mage | □ 535 □ 540 | Death Penalty Mandamus/ | Reporting Disclose | | | |
| and Corrupt | Judgment | □ 340 | Liability Marine | Product Lia | bility | | Other | ☐ 740 Railway | | | |
| Organizations 1 480 Consumer Credit | ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted | , | Marine Product | BANKRUPTC 422 Appeal 28 U | | | Civil Rights | □ 790 Other L | | | |
| ☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV | Student Loan (Excl. | C 350 | Liability Motor Vehicle | 158 | 130 | ∴.FC | Prison Condition RESTURE | Litigation | | | |
| □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/ | Veterans) | | Motor Vehicle | □ 423 Withdrawal | | 经过程 | PENALTY | Security | Act | | |
| Exchange | Overpayment of | | Product Liability | USC 157 CIVIL RIGHTS | 2 15.00 | □ 610 □ 620 | Agriculture Other Food & | PROPERTY | | TS | |
| □ 875 Customer Challenge 12 | Veteran's Benefits | □ 300 | Other Personal Injury | □441 Voting | | ₩ 020 | Drug | □ 820 Copyrig □ 830 Patent | เกเร | | |
| USC 3410 ☐ 890 Other Statutory Actions | ☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract | | Personal Injury- | ☐ 442 Employmen | | □ 625 | Drug Related | □ 840 Tradema | | ,- , | |
| □ 891 Agricultural Act | ☐ 195 Contract Product | | Med Malpractice Personal Injury- | ☐ 443 Housing/Ac mmodations | | | Seizure of Property 21 USC | SOCIAL SE | | ΓY | |
| ☐ 892 Economic Stabilization | Liability | | Product Liability | □ 444 Weifare | | | 881 | □ 862 Black L | | 23) | |
| Act ☐ 893 Environmental Matters | ☐ 196 Franchise | | Asbestos Personal | ☐ 445 American w | | | Liquor Laws | □ 863 DIWC/I | wwic | | |
| □ 894 Energy Allocation Act | REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation | | Injury Product Liability | Disabilities Employmen | | | R.R. & Truck Airline Regs | (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Ti | | | |
| | □ 220 Foreclosure | • IM | IMIGRATION 🦠 | ☐ 446 American w | ith [| | Occupational | □ 865 R\$I (40: | | | |
| | ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land | | Naturalization Application | Disabilities - | | 7 700 | Safety /Health | FEDERAL T | AX SU | | |
| Access to Justice | | □ 463 | Habcas Corpus- | Other 440 Other Civil | ľ | □ 690 | Otner | □ 870 Taxes (U or Defer | | untiff" | |
| ☐ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes | ☐ 290 All Other Real Property | □ 465 | Alien Detainee Other Immigration Actions | Rights | | | | □ 871 IRS-Thi USC 760 | rd Party | y 26 | |
| | | | | | | | | and the same | | | |
| | Ph | 1 | eV 1 | _ | | | , 3 <u>-</u> | a and | | | |
| ······································ | Z U | , | UV I | 2 - | 0 : | 17 | 76 | | C | _ | |
| FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: | Case Number: | | | | | ~ | | UNP] | 16 | Υ | |

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

CV-71 (05/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

| If yes, list case number(s): | s this action been pi | eviously filed in this court and dismissed, remanded or closed? We No Yes | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have If yes, list case number(s): | e any cases been pre | viously filed in this court that are related to the present case? 🗹 No 🗆 Yes | | | |
| Civil cases are deemed related if a | previously filed cas | e and the present case: | | | |
| | • | e or closely related transactions, happenings, or events; or | | | |
| □ B . | Call for determinati | on of the same or substantially related or similar questions of law and fact; or | | | |
| □ C. | For other reasons w | ould entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges; or | | | |
| □ D. | Involve the same pa | tent, trademark or copyright, and one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present. | | | |
| IX. VENUE: (When completing the | following informat | on, use an additional sheet if necessary.) | | | |
| (a) List the County in this District; ☐ Check here if the government, i | California County of ts agencies or emplo | utside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. yees is a named plaintiff. If this box is checked, go to item (b). | | | |
| County in this District:* | | California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country | | | |
| DAVID VAMVAKIAS, San Be | rnardino County, | DA CA | | | |
| | | utside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. yees is a named defendant. If this box is checked, go to item (c). | | | |
| County in this District:* | | California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country | | | |
| | | LINCOLN NATIONAL CORPORATION d/b/a LINCOLN FINANCIAL GROUP - Allen County, Indiana | | | |
| (c) List the County in this District; Note: In land condemnation c: | | utside of this District; State if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. n of the tract of land involved. | | | |
| County in this District:* | | California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country | | | |
| Plaintiff's Claim - San Bernardin | o County, CA | | | | |
| Note: In land condemnation cases, us | e the location of the | | | | |
| X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (| OR PRO PER): | Date October 16, 2012 | | | |
| or other papers as required by lav | v. This form, approv | vil Cover Sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings ed by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed of statistics, venue and initiating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.) | | | |
| Key to Statistical codes relating to So | cial Security Cases: | | | | |
| Nature of Suit Code | Abbreviation | Substantive Statement of Cause of Action | | | |
| 861 | НІА | All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b)) | | | |
| 862 | BL | All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923) | | | |

CV-71 (05/08) CIVIL COVER SHEET Page 2 of 2

Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))

Act, as amended.

U.S.C. (g))

All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))

All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security

All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security

All claims for retirement (old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42

863

863

864

865

DIWC

DIWW

SSID

RSI